

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael J. Coffy, #0001602171,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-123-BHH
v.)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Aramark Correctional Services LLC;)	
Mr. Isaih Williams, <i>Aramark Food</i>)	
<i>Services Supervisor</i> , Tom Crocker,)	
<i>Aramark Food Service Director</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Michael J. Coffy’s (“Plaintiff”) pro se complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary review.

On March 7, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation (“Report”), outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss Defendant Aramark Correctional Services LLC (“Aramark”) as a Defendant from this action. (ECF No. 25 at 4.) Attached to the Magistrate Judge’s Report was a notice advising the parties of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to

which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. Accordingly, the Court **adopts** the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 25) and dismisses Defendant Aramark from this action with prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Court has authorized the issuance and service of process on the remaining Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States District Judge

March 29, 2024
Charleston, South Carolina